

REMARKS

The present application includes claims 1-12 and 14-27. Claims 1-19 and 21-27 have been rejected by the Examiner. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 8, 15, 21, and 23 have been amended. By this Amendment, claims 13 and 20 have been cancelled.

The Applicant first notes that, as indicated by the Examiner in the Office Action, claim 13 was not present in the application as filed. The Examiner has treated claim 13 as a cancelled claim number and the Applicant agrees and has included claim 13 in the listing of claims above as a cancelled claim.

Claim 20 was subject to a restriction requirement.

Claims 3 and 23 were objected to because of informalities.

Claims 1-3, 8, 9, 15, 16, and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shiraogawa et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,343,305 ("Shiraogawa").

Claims 4-7, 10-12, 14, 17-19, and 24-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiraogawa in view of Shi et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,411,689 ("Shi").

The Applicant now turns to the restriction requirement made by the Examiner. The Examiner has identified the following two groups of claims and requires that the examination in the present case be restricted to only one of the groups of claims.

Group I: Claims 1-12, 14-19, and 21-27, drawn to a satellite-based facsimile distribution system, classified in class 358, subclass 1.15.

Group II: Claim 20, drawn to an Ethernet Digital Storage Card, classified in class 711, subclass 1.15.

As indicated by the Examiner in the Office Action, during a telephone conversation, an election was made to prosecute the claims of Group I, that is, claims 1-12, 14-19, and 21-27.

The Applicant hereby affirms the earlier telephonic election. Consequently, the claim of Group II, that is, claim 20, has been canceled.

The Applicant now turns to the objection to claims 3 and 23. Claims 3 and 23 were objected to due to informalities. Specifically, the Examiner noted in the Office Action that in both claims the recitation of "said recipient information" lacks antecedent basis. The Applicant has amended claims 3 and 23 to depend from claims 2 and 22, respectively which recite "recipient information." The Applicant respectfully submits that the elements recited in claims 3 and 23 as amended now have proper antecedent basis and that the Examiner's objection has been overcome.